The State has not publicly reported on the performance of each local program located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) for Indicator 8 A, 8B, and 8C.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69%.				nta	
intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 137 of 139 findings of noncompliance identified in					
[compraned marches]	FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner, and the remaining findings were corrected by July 1, 2007.					
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.4%.					
early intervention services in the	The State's data reflect a high level of perfo	ormance fo	r this indi	cator.		
home or programs for typically developing children.	The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.					
[Results Indicator]						
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:					
improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of	06-07 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior		
knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication);	a. % of infant & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0%	0%	0%		
and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	b. % of infant & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age	16.3%	6.1%	51.0%		
[Results Indicator; New]	peers. c. % of infant & toddlers who improved	51.0%	71.4%	26.5%		
	to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	51.070	/1.7/0	20.570		
	d. % of infant & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	14.3%	20.4%	18.4%		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same aged peers. e. % of infant & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18.4%	2.0%	4.1%	
	The State provided improvement activitie remaining years of the SPP. The State did not provide a list of the instrindicator.	is			
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	The State revised one improvement activition for Indicator 4C, in its SPP, and OSEP activities The State's reported data for this indicator.	cepts those i		nd the baseli	ine
A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	5
C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator; New]	A. Know their rights B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	93.5%	92.3%	95% 95%	
	C. Help their children develop and learn.	98.2% revised	96.3%	95%	
	These data represent slippage for Indicato unchanged for Indicator 4B, from the FFY				
	The State met its FFY 2006 targets for Indicator 4A.	neet			
	The State collected FFY 2006 data using methodologies, and concluded that data concluded valid and reliable data. It is OSEP's State will continue to use census rather that this indicator.	the			
5. Percent of infants and toddlers	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for the	is indicator	are .64 %	. These data	a

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:	represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of .71%.	
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of .73%.	
B. National data.		
[Results Indicator]		
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.37%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 1.48%.	
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.57%.	
B. National data.		
[Results Indicator]		
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 90.9%.	
evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	
within Part C's 45-day timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner.	
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 60.1%.	
transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	
other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:	The State reported that 20 of 22 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and the remaining findings were corrected by July 1, 2007.	
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;		
[Compliance Indicator]		
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 64%.	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 38 of 44 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and the remaining findings were corrected by July 1, 2007.		
potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]			
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 78.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 57%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 15 of 22 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the remaining findings were corrected by July 1, 2007.		
9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 95.5% The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that all remaining FFY 2005 findings were corrected by July 2007.		
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State did not attach Table 4.		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that there were no fully adjudicated due process hearing requests during the reporting period. The State did not attach Table 4.	
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). [Results Indicator]	Not applicable.	
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period. The State did not attach Table 4.	
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	